



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,958	10/19/2005	Yuuji Saiki	053230	9974
38834	7590	03/26/2008	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW				
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/553,958	SAIKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 11-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 11-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 3-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/19/05 & 5/4/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

1.Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 requires that it is the iodine-dyed film that is stretched while claim 8 recites that the iodine dyeing step is performed together with the stretching step. It would appear that the stretching step of claim 3 is not the same one as set forth in claim 8 and these should be differentiated. If they are indeed the same stretching step, then claim 8 fails to further limit claim 3, which recites that the already dyed film is stretched, not that the stretching and dyeing occur simultaneously. Clarification is required as to exactly what "the stretching step" at line 2 of claim 8 refers to.

2.The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sugino et al 2003/0137732 (see paragraphs 0018, 0044, 0047, 0052-0055 and 0057).

Sugino et al discloses the instant method of manufacturing a polarizer comprising the instant steps of dyeing the PVA film with iodine, uniaxially stretching the dyed film in a boric acid bath with at least 4-12% potassium iodide (paragraphs 0044 and 0047) and washing the film with an aqueous solution containing KI (see paragraphs 0052-0055). Drying at 70 deg C or less is taught at paragraph 0057. Note that paragraph 0018 teaches the instant transmittance and polarizing efficiency. Given that these properties are the same as that set forth in instant claim 9, and that the polarizer is made by the same method as recited in instant claims 3-8, it is submitted that the polarizer made by the method of Sugino et al inherently meets the limitations set forth in instant claim 9.

3.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugino et al (see paragraph 0018).

Sugino et al discloses the basic claimed method as set forth in paragraph 2, supra, the applied reference essentially lacking a clear showing of the instant dichroic ratio and iodine and potassium contents as set forth in claim 9—note that the transmittance and polarizing efficiency are taught in paragraph 0018. If the instant dichroic ratio and exact iodine and potassium content are not inherent

in the process of Sugino et al, it is submitted that such is obvious thereover. Ie, the process in the applied reference meets the instant method steps to make the instant polarizer. If a particular property is not inherent, then it would clearly be obvious thereover dependent on process parameters perhaps not recited in the claims.

4. It is noted that the search report considers Japanese document 2002-258,042 to be particularly relevant with respect to the method—the report suggests that the method is taught in paragraphs 0024-0029. Applicant is requested to provide a translation of these paragraphs or an English equivalent if such is readily available.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
March 22, 2008

/Mathieu D. Vargot/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791